

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed September 20, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1, 4, 6, 17, 20, and 21 have been amended. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed September 20, 2004, claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner states that clarification is required because claim 4 recites that the first adjustment travel is nonzero and claim 2 recites that the first adjustment travel is zero. Claim 2 is drawn to the specific embodiment shown in Figs. 3 and 4 in which the position of the A and B rollers is not adjusted while the C, D, E, and F rollers are adjusted. Claim 4 is drawn to the specific embodiment shown in Figs. 5 and 6 in which the position of the G rollers is not adjusted and the H, I, K, and L rollers are adjusted. The A and B rolls in Figs. 3 and 4, which have a zero travel, correspond to the same starting position as the I and H rolls in Figs. 5 and 6, which have a nonzero travel. Accordingly, in the configuration of Figs. 3 and 4, the rolls have zero travel and in the configuration of Figs. 5 and 6, the corresponding rolls have nonzero travel. In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 4 are definite and the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should now be withdrawn.

Claims 6-10 were found to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In view of the allowable subject matter, claims 7 and 8 have each been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, independent claims 7 and 8 should now be allowable. Dependent claims 9 and 10, being dependent on independent claims 7 and 8, respectively, should be allowable for the same reasons as are independent claims 7 and 8.

Claims 1-5 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,096,175 (Lange). The rejection of claims 1-5 and 11-13 is respectfully traversed in view of the following remarks.

Before discussing the cited prior art and the Examiner's rejections of the claims in view of that art, a brief summary of the present invention is appropriate. The present invention relates to an apparatus for adjusting pull rollers and/or cutting knives in folders, the adjustment being made for handling variable web widths. Figs. 1 and 2 of the present application show a folding assembly 1 having two folding formers 2, 3. The folding assembly includes sixteen pressure rollers 4 and three cutting knives 5 arranged above the two formers 2, 3 (see para. 0013, lines 1-2). Driven pull rods 6, 8 are arranged opposite the pressure rollers 4 and a knife roller 7 is arranged opposite the cutting knives 5 (para. 0013, lines 6-8). A printing material web 9 is led between the driven pull rods 6, 8 and the pressure rollers 4 and between the knife roller 7 and the cutting knives 5 (para. 0013, lines 9-11).

Each of the rollers 4 is mounted on a guide element 13 by a threaded bush 12 through which a threaded spindle 14 is rotatably inserted such that the axial position of the pressure rollers 4 is adjusted by rotating the threaded spindle 14 (para. 0014). The position of the pressure rollers 4 and the cutting knives is adjustable to accommodate different sized webs (see para. 0022). Figs. 3 and 4 show one configuration principle for adjusting the positions and Figs. 5 and 6 show a different configuration principle for adjusting the positions.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the adjustment is made to handle printing material webs of varying web widths and now recites "at least one threaded spindle operatively connected for adjusting axial positions of said web contacting elements simultaneously or in succession for handling printing material webs with variable web widths."

wherein a first portion of said web contacting elements are adjusted by a first adjustment travel and a second portion of said web contacting elements are adjusted by a second adjustment travel different than said first adjustment travel". Lange fails to teach or suggest the above limitations because Lange relates to adjusting the circumferential gap between folding jaws of a folding jaw cylinder.

Lange discloses a folding jaw cylinder 1 with a cylinder shaft 2 and two folding jaw carrier bodies 6, 7, which carry folding jaw pairs 3 (col. 3, lines 15-22). The jaw carrier bodies 6, 7 are connected by gears to a shaft 2 (col. 3, lines 42-68). A position spindle 25 is connected to a gear block 13 (col. 4, lines 18-21). Movement of the spindle 25 causes folding jaw carrier body 7 to rotate counter to carrier body 6 to effect a pincer-like or scissor like adjustment position movement (col. 4, lines 38-52). This allows the opening gap of the folding jaws to be adjusted to overcome the effects of wear (col. 2, lines 17-26).

Although Lange discloses the use of a spindle to make an adjustment, it is respectfully submitted that the adjustment of the gears connected to folding jaw carriers to change the gap between the folding jaws as disclosed by Lange fails to teach or suggest "at least one threaded spindle operatively connected for adjusting axial positions of said web contacting elements simultaneously or in succession for handling printing material webs with variable web widths, wherein a first portion of said web contacting elements are adjusted by a first adjustment travel and a second portion of said web contacting elements are adjusted by a second adjustment travel different than said first adjustment travel", as now recited in independent claim 1. The folding jaw gap adjustment disclosed by Lange can not be considered to be an axial adjustment. In contrast, the gap between the folding jaws in Lange runs along the length of the folding jaw cylinder so that the adjustment of the gap is perpendicular to the axial length of the cylinder.

Furthermore, Lange discloses that the spindle is part of an adjustment within the folding jaw cylinder. There is no teaching or suggestion in Lange regarding how the spindle 25 could be used for adjusting the axial positions of plural web contacting elements simultaneously or in succession, as recited in independent claim 1. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over AAPA in view of Lange.

Dependent claims 2-6 and 11-13, being dependent on independent claim 1, are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons expressed above with respect to independent claim 1.


The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By

  
Alfred W. Froeblich  
Reg. No. 38,887  
591 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: December 20, 2004